

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/647,457	08/26/2003	Toshio Yokoyama	2003_1207A	3237	
WENDEROTH, LIND & PONACK, L.L.P. 2033 K STREET N. W. SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20006-1021			EXAM	EXAMINER	
			LAMB, B	LAMB, BRENDA A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	.,		1734		
SHORTENED STATUTOR	RY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVER	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MO	NTHS	04/17/2007	PAI	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

•					
	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/647,457	YOKOYAMA ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Brenda A. Lamb	1734			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period variety reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 1/12/2007.					
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This	ra) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This action is non-final.				
,— ···	3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is				
closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	53 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims					
4) Claim(s) <u>1-3,5,22,23,25 and 27-33</u> is/are pend	ing in the application.				
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) 22,23,25 and 27-33 is/are allowed.					
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-3 and 5</u> is/are rejected.					
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.	r alastian rasuirament	· .			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.	•			
Application Papers					
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.	. •			
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:					
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.					
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No					
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage					
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).					
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.					
Attachment(s)	Δ. []	. (DTO 442)			
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) 🔲 Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D	ate			
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of Informal F	Patent Application			

Art Unit: 1734

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-3 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chikami in view of Brochner and ter Braak.

Chikami teaches the design of solution mixing apparatus comprised of the following elements: a plurality of solution supply tanks 2,5 wherein each of the supply tanks having temperature regulators (see column 2 lines 48-51); a mixing tank 10 which includes a stirrer; and a bath 11 connected to the mixing tank and the bath 11 having a stirrer for stirring the processing liquid into the bath. Chikami fails to teach as set forth in claim 1 that the mixer includes a temperature regulator and a substrate is processed in the bath 11 by bringing the substrate

Art Unit: 1734

into contact with the tank or a heat-insulating unit for keeping the bath 11 at a predetermined temperature. However, Brochner teaches the design of solution mixing apparatus wherein the solution supply sources are heated and heating elements which are controlled with a thermostat are embedded in the wall of bath 1 to maintain temperature within the bath at a constant temperature. Therefore, it would have been obvious to modify Chikami apparatus by providing the in-line mixing tank with a heated fluid jacket such as taught by ter Braak since Brocher teaches the importance of maintaining the temperature of the solutions to be mixed by providing heating means to heat and maintain the temperature of the desired processing liquid. Further, it would have been obvious that bath 11 in the Chikami apparatus as modified is capable of accepting a substrate for processing therein via the open top of the bath 11 which appears to be depicted in Figure 1 or via a separable top lid such as shown by Brochner for the obvious advantage to enable one to access the internal cavity formed within bath. Thus claims 1 and 3 are obvious over the above cited references. With respect to claim 5, the Chikami apparatus as modified is capable of accepting a solution within the scope of the claim. Note it has been held that a recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus satisfying the claimed structural limitations. Ex parte Masham, 2 USPQ 2d 1647 (1987). "[A]pparatus claims cover what a device is, not what a device does." Hewlett-Packard Co. v. Bausch & Lomb Inc., 909 F.2d 1464, 1469, 15 USPQ2d 1525, 1528 (Fed. Cir. 1990). With respect to claim 2, Chikami fails to teach a heat-

Art Unit: 1734

insulating unit keeping the bath 11 at a predetermined temperature. However, Brochner teaches bath 1 for mixing the two diverse components includes a heating means and a thermostat for maintaining the temperature at a predetermined temperature. Therefore, it would have been prima facie obvious given the modifications of the Chikami apparatus as discussed above to embed in the walls of the bath 11 with heating elements therein and surrounding these elements with heat insulating material for the obvious advantage of minimizing heat losses within the bath 11 especially since the given of teaching of Brochner the importance of maintaining the temperature the liquid mixture during mixing process.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claims 22-23, 25 and 27-33 are allowed.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Gray et al shows surrounding a tank with a heat insulating jacket containing heating elements which are energized by an external power source.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brenda A. Lamb whose telephone number is (571) 272-1231. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Tuesday and Thursday-Friday with alternate Wednesdays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chris Fiorilla, can be reached on (571)272-1231. The fax

Art Unit: 1734

phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Brenda A Lamb Examiner

Art Unit 1734